

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION RECORD					
ADDRESSEE	Bill Ward Region VII (KC)	X-7144	ORIGINATOR	D. Shadoff	
FM	WASH DC	ID	FLT	DATE	PAGES OF 3
TO	Region 7	REMARKS	5-8731		

RECEIVED

APR 06 1982

SUPPORT SERVICES

Return to D. Shadoff

EN 338

3 pages to follow

EPA Form 5040-6 (11-75)

this document is part of HQ's book

CHRISTOPHER S. FOND
CO-SPONSOR



JAMES L. WILSON
DIRECTOR

missouri department of natural resources

1014 Madison St.
P.O. Box 1368 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 314-751-3241

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 12, 1976

FROM: Kenneth M. Karch, Director, Division of Environmental Quality

TO: James L. Wilson, Director, Department of Natural Resources

SUBJECT: Budget

As a result of our House Appropriations Committee budget hearing last week I wish to express my concurrence with your concern that the legislature may be unwilling to support the department's No. 1 and 2 priorities even though they have been proposed by the Governor to be funded out of revenue sharing funds. As you are aware DNR's priority No. 1 and 2 both relate to the Division of Environmental Quality (Priority No. 1 involves maintenance of 19.3 existing positions which are currently filled; Priority No. 2 involves 12 new positions necessary for the conduct of the water pollution control permit system (NPDES)).

I have therefore attempted to set forth in this memorandum the implications for Missouri's environmental programs should these priorities not be funded.

If the department's No. 1 priority is not funded the following results are likely:

1. The department will be forced to lay off 19 existing employees.
2. Field services to local governments and industries from our regional offices will be cutback 20-25% and our air quality and water quality programs will be cut by 15-20% as a direct result of loss of employees.
3. More importantly, the focus of the department will need to be shifted from a service orientation to an enforcement orientation in order to meet the mandatory requirements of both state and federal law. This is particularly distasteful to our regional office personnel who have built good relationships with local public and private officials through their provisions of direct service to them.

RECEIVED

JAN 16 1976

4. The department will be forced to request the federal Environmental Protection Agency to carry out certain review of plans and specifications, inspections of facilities, and enforcement actions directly. Such a move is very distasteful to me in view of the overall good relationship that this agency has had with industry and local governments, and the implied admission of failure by the state to meet its responsibilities. Furthermore, the federal agent is not guided by the policies of a lay commission which can take into account local conditions.
5. The department is likely to loose between \$100,000 and \$200,000 in federal program grant funds as a result of the increased federal involvement thereby forcing additional layoffs of state personnel.

If the department's No. 2 priority is not funded the following results are likely:

1. It will probably be necessary to return partial or full responsibility for carrying out the NPDES permit program to the federal Environmental Protection Agency, which will then issue federal permits, do inspections of facilities, monitor compliance with the permit requirements, and take enforcement actions against non compliers, again without local appeal to the Clean Water Commission. The department has already reduced efforts within the water quality program to the greatest extent possible in order to carry out the NPDES permit program in the current fiscal year since personnel recommended by the Governor last year for similar purposes were not provided by the legislature. Specifically:
 1. We have refused to continue entering permit information on computer facilities because of the high initial manpower costs involved. While this reduces initial manpower needs, it increases long term manpower needs for retrieval, delays retrieval (which must be done by hand); and eliminates the possibility of using the data for many water quality management decisions.
 2. Refused, (by turning over to the Environmental Protection Agency) to carry out the initial notification and response activities relating to emergency spills, of which there were over 200 last year in Missouri. In view of the fact that the legislature has refused to provide additional authorization and funding for the program during the last 3 legislative sessions, we have concluded that it assigns this program a low priority.
 3. Canceled all but \$15,000 of a \$60,000 contract with the U.S. Geological Survey for stream gauging and monitoring.
 4. Discontinued further activity in the area of operator training and diverted that position to the permit program.

203

2. Because the NPDES permit program forms the backbone of the water pollution control efforts in this state, assumption of the program by the federal agency will have profound effects on long term water quality management planning, service versus regulatory mechanisms, and the priorities assigned in the construction grants program, which is expected to result in \$150 million and \$200 million per year in new sewage works construction in Missouri.
3. The department will probably loose between \$200,000 and \$300,000 from our water quality base grant which is currently used to support existing personnel as a result of federal assumption of the NPDES program. This will result in additional layoffs of state personnel.
4. The state is still required to carry out its own permit program by state law at a level comparable to the federal permit program.

303

XMK/EW